

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the courtesy extended by the Examiner during the telephonic interview conducted on January 14, 2010. The amendments to claims set forth above and the following remarks reflect the substance of the interview.

Applicant has amended claims 15 and 18 to recite features the Examiner agreed overcome the outstanding rejection. The claim language is supported by the as-field specification, e.g., at page 5, lines 14-18, and page 18, line 11-page 19, line 25. No new matter has been introduced.

Claims 1-6, 8-10, 12-15, 17, and 18 are currently pending, with claims 1-6 and 14 being withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully reconsideration of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 15 and 18 over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0088336 to Sakamoto et al. ("Sakamoto") in view of U.S. 6,777,684 to Volkov et al. ("Volkov"), and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0142247 to Nishiyama et al ("Nishiyama"); the § 103(a) rejection of claims 8-9 and 12-13 over Sakamoto in view of Volkov, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0017313 to Menache; and the § 103(a) rejection of claims 10 and 17 over Sakamoto in view of Volkov, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/024588 to Aksyuk et al.

Amended claims 15 and 18 recite, among other things, "[a] reflection plate . . . configured to deform into a plurality of concave/convex portions; and a driving portion configured to move part of the reflection plate such that shapes of the concave/convex portions and a reflection state of the reflection plate are changed."

As agreed to by the Examiner during the interview, none of the cited references discloses or suggests “a driving portion configured to move part of [a] reflection plate such that shapes of . . . concave/convex portions and a reflection state of the reflection plate are changed,” as recited in amended claims 15 and 18.

Moreover, Nishiyama is directed to a reflector having a plurality of convex portions used for a liquid crystal display (LCD) panel (abstract). Nishiyama, e.g., at ¶ [0291]-[0293], further discloses that convex portions 304 are formed of a photosensitive resin material, such as positive resists, on a substrate 302 formed of an insulating substrate such as glass. As acknowledged by the Examiner during the interview, a reflector made of rigid material and used for LCD panel, as taught in Nakayama, is not easily deformable, and thus is not “configured to deform into a plurality of concave/convex portions,” as recited in amended claims 15 and 18. Accordingly, the cited references, viewed alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of amended claims 15 and 18.

Further, Sakamoto is directed to a radar system having a high-frequency transmitting/receiving apparatus to be used in a vehicle or a small boat (abstract). Volkov is directed to an imaging system to detect concealed objects to be used in security systems e.g., at airports (col. 3, lines 42-26). Nishiyama is directed to a reflector having a plurality of convex portions to be used for a LCD panel (abstract). Since the cited references are directed to completely different technical fields, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have had any reason to consider incorporating features of these references in combination with one another.

For at least the foregoing reasons, amended claims 15 and 18, and their respective dependent claims 8-10, 12, and 17, are allowable over the cited references.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application, withdrawal of the rejections, and timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: January 22, 2010

By: /Anthony M. Gutowski/
Anthony M. Gutowski
Reg. No. 38,742
(202) 408-4000